

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD**

THADDEUS CLEVELAND,
Appellant,

DOCKET NUMBER
DA-1221-16-0510-W-1

v.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY,
Agency.

DATE: May 16, 2023

THIS FINAL ORDER IS NONPRECEDENTIAL¹

Thaddeus Cleveland, Sanderson, Texas, pro se.

Kathryn A. Price, Esquire, Marfa, Texas, for the agency.

BEFORE

Cathy A. Harris, Vice Chairman
Raymond A. Limon, Member

FINAL ORDER

¶1 The appellant has filed a petition for review of the initial decision, which denied corrective action in his individual right of action (IRA) appeal. Generally, we grant petitions such as this one only in the following circumstances: the initial decision contains erroneous findings of material fact; the initial decision is

¹ A nonprecedential order is one that the Board has determined does not add significantly to the body of MSPB case law. Parties may cite nonprecedential orders, but such orders have no precedential value; the Board and administrative judges are not required to follow or distinguish them in any future decisions. In contrast, a precedential decision issued as an Opinion and Order has been identified by the Board as significantly contributing to the Board's case law. See [5 C.F.R. § 1201.117\(c\)](#).

based on an erroneous interpretation of statute or regulation or the erroneous application of the law to the facts of the case; the administrative judge's rulings during either the course of the appeal or the initial decision were not consistent with required procedures or involved an abuse of discretion, and the resulting error affected the outcome of the case; or new and material evidence or legal argument is available that, despite the petitioner's due diligence, was not available when the record closed. Title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations, section 1201.115 ([5 C.F.R. § 1201.115](#)). After fully considering the filings in this appeal, we conclude that the petitioner has not established any basis under section 1201.115 for granting the petition for review. Therefore, we DENY the petition for review and AFFIRM the initial decision, which is now the Board's final decision. [5 C.F.R. § 1201.113\(b\)](#).

¶2 The appellant is the Patrol Agent in Charge at the agency's Sanderson Border Patrol Station in Sanderson, Texas. Initial Appeal File (IAF), Tab 6 at 4. In August 2016, he filed an IRA appeal with the Board alleging that the agency retaliated against him for whistleblowing activity when it failed to pay him a performance award for Fiscal Year 2015. IAF, Tab 1 at 5. The appellant did not request a hearing, and the administrative judge issued an initial decision on the written record finding that the appellant established jurisdiction and made a prima facie case of whistleblower retaliation. *Id.* at 2; IAF, Tab 26, Initial Decision (ID) at 2-5, 17-18; *see* [5 U.S.C. § 1221\(e\)\(1\)](#); *Yunus v. Department of Veterans Affairs*, [242, F.3d 1367](#), 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2001). However, the administrative judge denied corrective action because she further found that the agency met its burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that it would have taken the same action in the absence of the appellant's whistleblower activity. ID at 18-29; *see Carr v. Social Security Administration*, [185 F.3d 1318](#), 1323 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

¶3 The appellant has filed a petition for review primarily arguing that the agency did not cooperate during the discovery process and did not provide the information described in his Freedom of Information Act request. Petition for

Review File, Tab 1 at 3. The appellant asserts that, had the agency fully cooperated with the information-gathering process during discovery, he would have been able to show that the agency treated similarly situated employees who were not whistleblowers differently than it treated the appellant. *Id.*; see *Carr*, 185 F.3d at 1323 (finding that one factor in considering whether the agency proved that it would have taken the same action even absent the appellant's whistleblowing activity is whether the agency takes similar actions against employees who are not whistleblowers but who are otherwise similarly situated).

¶4 Here, the administrative judge informed the parties of their discovery obligations, including the requirement that they attempt to resolve a discovery dispute privately before filing a motion to compel with the administrative judge. IAF, Tab 2 at 3; [5 C.F.R. §§ 1201.71](#), 1201.73. Throughout the appeal process below, the administrative judge again informed the appellant that the Board generally does not participate in the discovery process until there is a failure or refusal to fully reply to the discovery request and a motion to compel discovery is filed. IAF, Tab 18 at 1; [5 C.F.R. § 1201.73\(c\)\(2\)](#). Further, the agency filed its own motion to compel concerning the appellant's alleged unsatisfactory responses to its discovery requests. IAF, Tab 21. Thus, we find that the appellant was aware of the obligation to raise a discovery dispute and, if necessary, to file a motion to compel with the administrative judge.

¶5 Nonetheless, the record shows that the appellant did not file a motion to compel with the administrative judge, and the Board has held that an appellant's failure to do so precludes him from raising a discovery dispute for the first time on review. *Szejner v. Office of Personnel Management*, [99 M.S.P.R. 275](#), ¶ 5 (2005), *aff'd*, 167 F. App'x 217 (Fed. Cir. 2006). Therefore, we find the appellant's argument to be without merit.

¶6 Accordingly, we deny the appellant's petition for review and affirm the initial decision.

NOTICE OF APPEAL RIGHTS²

You may obtain review of this final decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7703](#)(a)(1). By statute, the nature of your claims determines the time limit for seeking such review and the appropriate forum with which to file. [5 U.S.C. § 7703](#)(b). Although we offer the following summary of available appeal rights, the Merit Systems Protection Board does not provide legal advice on which option is most appropriate for your situation and the rights described below do not represent a statement of how courts will rule regarding which cases fall within their jurisdiction. If you wish to seek review of this final decision, you should immediately review the law applicable to your claims and carefully follow all filing time limits and requirements. Failure to file within the applicable time limit may result in the dismissal of your case by your chosen forum.

Please read carefully each of the three main possible choices of review below to decide which one applies to your particular case. If you have questions about whether a particular forum is the appropriate one to review your case, you should contact that forum for more information.

(1) Judicial review in general. As a general rule, an appellant seeking judicial review of a final Board order must file a petition for review with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which must be received by the court within **60 calendar days** of the date of issuance of this decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7703](#)(b)(1)(A).

If you submit a petition for review to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, you must submit your petition to the court at the following address:

² Since the issuance of the initial decision in this matter, the Board may have updated the notice of review rights included in final decisions. As indicated in the notice, the Board cannot advise which option is most appropriate in any matter.

U.S. Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit
717 Madison Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20439

Additional information about the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit is available at the court's website, www.cafc.uscourts.gov. Of particular relevance is the court's "Guide for Pro Se Petitioners and Appellants," which is contained within the court's Rules of Practice, and Forms 5, 6, 10, and 11.

If you are interested in securing pro bono representation for an appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, you may visit our website at <http://www.mspb.gov/probono> for information regarding pro bono representation for Merit Systems Protection Board appellants before the Federal Circuit. The Board neither endorses the services provided by any attorney nor warrants that any attorney will accept representation in a given case.

(2) Judicial or EEOC review of cases involving a claim of discrimination. This option applies to you only if you have claimed that you were affected by an action that is appealable to the Board and that such action was based, in whole or in part, on unlawful discrimination. If so, you may obtain judicial review of this decision—including a disposition of your discrimination claims—by filing a civil action with an appropriate U.S. district court (*not* the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit), within **30 calendar days after you receive** this decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7703](#)(b)(2); *see Perry v. Merit Systems Protection Board*, [582 U.S. 420](#) (2017). If you have a representative in this case, and your representative receives this decision before you do, then you must file with the district court no later than **30 calendar days after your representative** receives this decision. If the action involves a claim of discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or a disabling condition, you may be entitled to representation by a court-appointed lawyer and to waiver of any

requirement of prepayment of fees, costs, or other security. See [42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5\(f\)](#) and [29 U.S.C. § 794a](#).

Contact information for U.S. district courts can be found at their respective websites, which can be accessed through the link below:

http://www.uscourts.gov/Court_Locator/CourtWebsites.aspx.

Alternatively, you may request review by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) of your discrimination claims only, excluding all other issues. [5 U.S.C. § 7702\(b\)\(1\)](#). You must file any such request with the EEOC's Office of Federal Operations within **30 calendar days** after you receive this decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7702\(b\)\(1\)](#). If you have a representative in this case, and your representative receives this decision before you do, then you must file with the EEOC no later than **30 calendar days** after your representative receives this decision.

If you submit a request for review to the EEOC by regular U.S. mail, the address of the EEOC is:

Office of Federal Operations
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
P.O. Box 77960
Washington, D.C. 20013

If you submit a request for review to the EEOC via commercial delivery or by a method requiring a signature, it must be addressed to:

Office of Federal Operations
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
131 M Street, N.E.
Suite 5SW12G
Washington, D.C. 20507

(3) Judicial review pursuant to the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012. This option applies to you only if you have raised claims of reprisal for whistleblowing disclosures under [5 U.S.C. § 2302\(b\)\(8\)](#) or other protected activities listed in [5 U.S.C. § 2302\(b\)\(9\)\(A\)\(i\)](#), (B), (C), or (D). If so, and your judicial petition for review “raises no challenge to the Board’s

disposition of allegations of a prohibited personnel practice described in section 2302(b) other than practices described in section 2302(b)(8), or 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), or (D),” then you may file a petition for judicial review either with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or any court of appeals of competent jurisdiction.³ The court of appeals must receive your petition for review within **60 days** of the date of issuance of this decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7703\(b\)\(1\)\(B\)](#).

If you submit a petition for judicial review to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, you must submit your petition to the court at the following address:

U.S. Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit
717 Madison Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20439

Additional information about the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit is available at the court’s website, www.cafc.uscourts.gov. Of particular relevance is the court’s “Guide for Pro Se Petitioners and Appellants,” which is contained within the court’s Rules of Practice, and Forms 5, 6, 10, and 11.

If you are interested in securing pro bono representation for an appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, you may visit our website at <http://www.mspb.gov/probono> for information regarding pro bono representation for Merit Systems Protection Board appellants before the Federal Circuit. The Board neither endorses the services provided by any attorney nor warrants that any attorney will accept representation in a given case.

³ The original statutory provision that provided for judicial review of certain whistleblower claims by any court of appeals of competent jurisdiction expired on December 27, 2017. The All Circuit Review Act, signed into law by the President on July 7, 2018, permanently allows appellants to file petitions for judicial review of MSPB decisions in certain whistleblower reprisal cases with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or any other circuit court of appeals of competent jurisdiction. The All Circuit Review Act is retroactive to November 26, 2017. Pub. L. No. 115-195, 132 Stat. 1510.

Contact information for the courts of appeals can be found at their respective websites, which can be accessed through the link below:

http://www.uscourts.gov/Court_Locator/CourtWebsites.aspx.

FOR THE BOARD:

/s/ for

Jennifer Everling
Acting Clerk of the Board

Washington, D.C.